



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,905	11/28/2002	Xi-Yu Liu	IACP0023USA	5306

27765 7590 07/05/2005

NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE (NAIPC)  
P.O. BOX 506  
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/065,905

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 1 recites "the same language" (lines 7, 11), "the same meaning" (line 9), "the vocabulary entry of the same meaning" (line 12). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
2. Claim 4 recites "the number of language files" (line 2). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 4, 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art does not teach storing vocabularies in language files after the vocabularies are converted from Unicode version II format to Unicode format.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “according to the number of languages” (line 6) is not clearly defined. It is unclear this limitation refers to “the quantity of different languages” or “the types of different languages”.

Also, the phrase “storing vocabulary entries of different languages in different files” (line 7-8) is not clearly defined. Claim 1 recites “the number of languages in the text file” (line 6) which claims “multiple of languages in one file”. However, the phrase “storing vocabulary entries of different languages in different files” (line 7-8) claims “different languages in different files”. Two contradicting limitations are claimed in this claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dybedokken et al (US: 6760411), and in view of Lee et al (US: 6192344), and further in view of Osder et al (US: 6058166).

Regarding claim 1, Dybedokken et al teach on column 4 line 5 and line 25-52, multiple languages (reads on claimed “vocabulary entries”) can be selected to be displayed on a mobile terminal.

Dybedokken et al failed to teach “storing vocabulary entries of the same language in the same file”. However, Lee et al teach on column 8 line 54-59, different languages on different files.

Dybedokken et al failed to teach “a same index for every vocabulary of the same meaning expressed in different languages, and different indexes for different vocabulary entries expressed in the same language”. However, Osder et al teach on Fig. 8, vocabularies are indexed. How the vocabularies are indexed is a “Design Choice”.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Dybedokken et al to have the “storing vocabulary entries of the same language in the same file” and “a same index for every vocabulary of the same meaning expressed in different languages, and different indexes for different vocabulary entries expressed in the same language” as taught by Lee et al and Osder et al such that the modified system of Dybedokken et al would be able to support the system users conveniences of storing same language vocabularies in a file and index same meaning vocabularies with a same index.

Regarding claim 2, the modified system of Dybedokken et al in view of Lee et al and further in view of Osder et al failed to teach “vocabularies are stored according to a predetermined format”. However, Osder et al teach on Fig. 8, a predetermined format for storing vocabularies.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Dybedokken et al in view of Lee et al and further in view of Osder et al to have the “vocabularies are stored according to a predetermined format” as taught Osder et al such that the modified system of Dybedokken et al in view of Lee et al and further in view of Osder et al would be able to support the system users conveniences of storing vocabularies in a predetermined format.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dybedokken et al, and in view of Lee et al, and further in view of Osder et al, and further in view of Lin (US: 6907431).

The modified system of Dybedokken et al in view of Lee et al and further in view of Osder et al failed to teach “vocabularies are stored by Unicode, version II”. However, Lin teaches on column 4 line 11-12, words are encoded by Unicode format. The version of Unicode to be used is a “design choice”.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Dybedokken et al in view of Lee et al and further in view of Osder et al to have the “vocabularies are stored by Unicode, version II” as taught Lin such that the modified system of Dybedokken et al in view of Lee et al and further in view of Osder et al would be able to support the system users conveniences of encoding the words by using Unicode version II.

Art Unit: 2645

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Miller et al (US: 6717588) teach multilingual user interface for an operating system.

8. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (571) 272-7535. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (571) 272-7547. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**


**Washington, D.C. 20231**

**Or faxed to Central FAX Number 703-872-9306.**

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



**FAN TSANG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**